



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/658,376	09/10/2003	Dan Nilsson	NILSSON=6B	5425
1444	7590	09/11/2006	EXAMINER	
BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C. 624 NINTH STREET, NW SUITE 300 WASHINGTON, DC 20001-5303			AFREMOVA, VERA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1651	

DATE MAILED: 09/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/658,376	NILSSON, DAN	
	Examiner Vera Afremova	Art Unit 1651	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 June 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 6,7,9-11,27 and 30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 6,7,9-11,27 and 30 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All. b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action (6/20/2006) is acknowledged and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Claims 6, 7, 9-11, 27 and 30 as amended (6/20/2006) are pending and under examination.

Deposit

The deposit requirement for strains *Lactococcus lactis* subsp. *lactis* DN221 (DSM 11034) and *Lactococcus lactis* subsp. *lactis* DN227 (DSM 11040) have been met in the response papers filed 11/01/2005.

Claim Objections

Claim 6, 7, 9-11, 27 and 30 are objected to because of the following informalities:

The abbreviated term such as "Pfl" that stands for pyruvate fromate lyase should be explained at first instant of the claims with abbreviation in the parenthesis. The abbreviated term can be used thereafter. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Indefinite

Claim 11 as amended remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 11 is indefinite because it is unclear what “characteristics” of the specifics strains are included into and/or excluded from the scope of the claimed subject matter. The metes and bounds of the claim cannot be determined. It is suggested to write, for example: “...strain having **all of the characteristics**” of the strain DSM ###.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 6, 7 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a or b) as being anticipated by Takahashi et al. (“Oxygen sensitivity of sugar metabolism and interconversion of pyruvate formate lyase in intact cells of *Streptococcus mutans* and *Streptococcus sanguis*”. Infection and Immunity. March 1987, Vol. 55, No. 3, pages 652-656) or by Yamamoto et al. (“Cloning and sequence analysis of the pfl gene encoding private formate lyases from *Streptococcus mutans*. Infection and Immunity. February 1996, Vol. 64, No. 2, pages 358-391).

Claims are directed to a Pfl-defective mutant of lactic acid bacterium selected from the group of species belonging to *Streptococcus*. The claimed bacterium is characterized relatively to the parent or wild-type strain by at least one characteristics such as that it does not produce formate under anaerobic conditions, does not produce ethanol under anaerobic conditions, produced less of acid under anaerobic conditions, is characterized by production of acetolactate-

Art Unit: 1651

derived metabolite(s), is characterized by capability to grow on M17 medium under aerobic conditions and/or has reduced growth on M17 medium under anaerobic conditions. The claimed bacterium is made by selection of mutants that does not growth on acetate-containing medium under anaerobic conditions. Some claims are further drawn to the strain capable of producing acetoin. Some claims are further drawn to a starter composition comprising the PFL defective lactic acid bacterium.

The cited references by Takahashi et al. and by Yamamoto et al. discloses Pfl-defective mutants of lactic acid bacteria belonging to *Streptococcus sp* and compositions therewith.

For example: see Takahashi et al. entire document including abstract and figures 1-2, wherein the reference teaches that exposure to oxygen result in inactivation of pfl and in possession of mutants with reversible and irreversible pfl. The mutants with inactivated pfl have at least one of the characteristics as required for the claimed mutant, for example: the oxygen inactivated mutants or the “aerated” cultures demonstrate “essentially no production of formate”, “reduced production of ethanol and acetate”, “reduced rate of acid production” under anaerobic conditions (figures 2 and 3).

For example: see Yamamoto et al. at page 385, col. 2, lines 7-8, wherein the reference explicitly reports an isolation of pfl-negative mutant of *Streptococcus mutans*.

The claimed characteristics (i) through (v) are result of an inactivation of pfl or of a lack of pfl. Although characteristics of the parent or wild type strains of the referenced pfl mutants are not indicated or disclosed, the relative enhancement and/or relative differences of claimed features cannot be determined and they would not be meaningful unless some specific and particular strains are claimed. Although it is uncertain how the referenced bacteria have not been

made or selected, they are the PFL-defective mutants and, thus, they are characterized by the same features that are required during selection method as encompassed by the claims. The PFL defective mutant in a culture medium is a starter composition within the meaning of the claims.

Thus, the presently claimed pfl defective mutant(s) and composition(s) therewith are anticipated by the cited references.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent
- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6, 7, 9-11, 27 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a,b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Hugenholtz (IDS reference; "Citrate metabolism in lactic bacteria". FEMS Microbiology Reviews 1993, 12, 165-178), Takahashi et al. ("Oxygen sensitivity of sugar metabolism and interconversion of pyruvate formate lyase in intact cells of *Streptococcus mutans* and *Streptococcus sanguis*". Infection and Immunity. March

Art Unit: 1651

1987, Vol. 55, No. 3, pages 652-656), Yamamoto et al. ("Cloning and sequence analysis of the pfl gene encoding private formate lyases from *Streptococcus mutans*. Infection and Immunity. February 1996, Vol. 64, No. 2, pages 358-391) in the light of evidence by the ATCC Catalogue.

Claims are directed to a Pfl-defective mutant of lactic acid bacterium selected from the group of species belonging to *Streptococcus*, *Bifidobacterium*, *Pediococcus* and *Lactococcus* including *Lactococcus lactic* subsp. *lactis/diacetalicus*. The claimed bacterium is characterized relatively to the parent or wild-type strain by at least one characteristics such as that it does not produce formate under anaerobic conditions, does not produce ethanol under anaerobic conditions, is characterized by production of acetolactate-derived metabolite(s), is characterized by capability to grow on M17 medium under aerobic conditions and has reduced growth on M17 medium under anaerobic conditions. The claimed bacterium is made by selection of mutants that does not growth on acetate-containing medium under anaerobic conditions. Some claims are further drawn to the strain capable of producing acetoin. Some claims are further drawn to a starter composition comprising the PFL defective lactic acid bacterium.

The reference by Hugenholtz teaches that the group of lactic bacteria including homofermentative and heterofermentative lactic bacteria convert sugars to lactic acid via intermediate pyruvate (page 171, col. 2, par. 3 and figure 1), that pfl in the lactic bacteria is responsible for production of formate, acetate and ethanol and that inactivation of the pfl activity in the mutants of the lactic bacteria result in disappearance of production of formate, acetate and ethanol (page 171, col. 2, par. 3).

In particular, the cited reference by Hugenholtz teaches that the pfl enzyme inactivation by oxygen and resulting changes in product formation are observed for *Lactococcus lactis* (page

Art Unit: 1651

171, col. 2, par. 3, lines 22-24 and fig. 2). The references by Takahashi et al. and by Yamamoto et al. teaches the same concept of pfl inactivation and resulting changes in product formation as observed for mutants of the *Streptococcus* species.

In view of the Fig. 1 teaching by Hugenoltz and in view of the fig. 2-3 teaching by Takahashi, the PFL "defective" mutants of lactic bacteria are and/or would be characterized by "essentially no production" of formate, acetate and ethanol and it they also would be characterized by production of acetolactate-derived metabolite(s) including acetoin as required for the claimed bacterium. Thus, the cited references by Hugenoltz et al., by Takahashi et al and/or by Yamamoto et al. appear to anticipate the claimed invention.

Although characteristics of the parent or wild type strains of the referenced PFL mutants are not indicated or disclosed, the relative enhancement and/or relative differences of claimed features cannot be determined and they would not be meaningful unless some specific and particular strains are claimed.

Although it is uncertain how the referenced bacteria have not been made or selected, they are the PFL-defective mutants and, thus, they are characterized by the same features that are required during selection method as encompassed by the claims.

The teaching of the cited references relate to the group of lactic bacteria as a whole including species belonging to *Streptococcus* and *Lactococcus* including *Lactococcus lactic* subsp. *lactis/diacetalicus*. Although some of the other species such as *Bifidobacterium* and *Pediococcus* are not explicitly disclosed by Hugenoltz et al., Takahashi et al and by Yamamoto et al., the bacterial species of lactic bacteria have been frequently cross-identified and reclassified between these genera and species (as demonstrated by ATCC catalogue, see pages

Art Unit: 1651

68, 199, 205, 264 and 346) and, thus, there is a reasonable believe that the pfl defective lactic bacteria of the cited references might be assigned to any and all of the presently claimed genera and/or species. Moreover, the reference by Hugenholtz teaches that lactic bacteria including homofermentative and heterofermentative lactic bacteria convert sugars to lactic acid via intermediate pyruvate (page 171, col. 2, par. 3 and figure 1), that pfl in the lactic bacteria is responsible for production of formate, acetate and ethanol and that inactivation of the pfl activity in the mutants of the lactic bacteria result in disappearance of production of formate, acetate and ethanol (page 171, col. 2, par. 3). Thus, regardless the specific taxonomic assignment of some particular species within the group of lactic bacteria, the pyruvate metabolism pathway and the end product resulting from the pfl inactivation are the same and/or similar for lactic bacteria as the whole group. Thus, the "pfl defective mutant" of the presently claimed species is an obvious variant the lactic bacteria disclosed by the cited references within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Therefore, the claimed invention as a whole was clearly *prima facie* obvious, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

With respect to the instant claim 11, even if the claimed microorganisms are not identical to the referenced bacteria with regard to some unidentified characteristics, the differences between that which is disclosed and that which is claimed are considered to be so slight that the referenced microorganisms are likely inherently possess the same characteristics of the claimed microorganisms particularly in view of the same and/or similar pyruvate metabolism pathway and pfl inactivation. The claim 11 as amended remains indefinite with respect to the identifying characteristics of the strains as explained above.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments and Declaration by Eric Johansen filed on 6/20/2006 have been fully considered are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Some of the arguments and the contents of the declaration are directed to the idea that lactic acid metabolic pathways are distinct in the homofermentative lactic acid bacteria and in the heterofermentative lactic acid bacteria. However, as related to the pyruvate metabolism and the pfl inactivation the lactic bacteria are the same and/or similar since lactic bacteria convert sugars to lactic acid via pyruvate as intermediate product. Although the exact amounts of specific end products in homofermentative and heterofermentative lactic acid bacteria might be different, the inactivation of pfl in lactic acid bacteria result in the presently features including "essentially no production" of formate, acetate and ethanol as adequately taught and/or suggested by Hugenholtz et al. and Takahashi et al.

Claim 11, drawn to the specific applicants' isolates deposited in DSM, might be allowable upon resolution of the 112-2 issue(s).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vera Afremova whose telephone number is (571) 272-0914. The examiner can normally be reached from Monday to Friday from 9.30 am to 6.00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Wityshyn can be reached at (571) 272-0926.

The fax phone number for the TC 1600 where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Art Unit: 1651

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology center 1600, telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Vera Afremova

AU 1651

September 5, 2006



VERA AFREMOVA

PRIMARY EXAMINER